App.F.IX-4]

WD2239.B490.

1924.

File No. 124-24

Previous References. (Courts)

Cs 266-23 (1-6)
" 124-24 (1)
" 124-24 (2)
" 124-24 (5)

Serial Nos. 3-4, 6-7

preserve

Later references.

Cs- 118-33-34
R-A 43-34 SC: 142, 13 July 1935

GENERAL & REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. Four

Part B for June 1925

SUBJECT

Adjournment of Cases in the various Courts during the Sessions of the L.C and R.A.

No: P.6714 dated 16/6/25. To. The Registrar, Chief Court.

States that Govt. agree with the views expressed by the Chief Court re the practice of issuing general orders to the Sub-ordinate Courts to adjourn such Cases

9/7/25

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Courts)

NOTES.

File No. 124-24

FILE HEADING.

Adjournment of Cases in the various Courts during the Sessions of the Le and Rt.

From

No.	Dated	Received

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

(For Disposal at a Meeting)

No. C. 411

9 1925

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Council Matter.

SUBJECT.

(Clause xxvii of the Schedule)

Proposals in connection with the adjournment of cases posted during the meetings of the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council when the legal practitioners or parties concerned in the cases happen to be members of those bodies.

CIRCULATED TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

By Order,

9th April 1925.

Offg. *Chief Secretary to Government.*

Extraordinary Member of Council.

219 11-4-25 **First Member of Council.**

825-4 13/4 **Second Member of Council.**

11 10e. 14/4

Extra Member of Council.

26°3 CS-1124-24-3

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

From
mr j Reddappa. Letter dt 18.12.24.
States that the first munsiff
Tumkur refused to adjourn his
case and requests that instructions
might be issued to cancel the orders
passed in his absence and recd to
repeat such things in future.

6 (11) In Letter no P 2952/CS 1124-24-2
dt 10-12-24 the Registr was requested
to issue instructions to all the
Courts in the State to adjourn the
cases of lawyers and parties
who are members of the L C during
the session of the L.C.

Mr. Reddappa, a member of the
R A and L C complains that
his case was not adjourned by the
first Munsiff Tumkur. It is
not known why he refused and whether
the Chief Court instructions were
received by him in time. If
adjourned the letter may be sent
to the Registr Chief Court for disposal
Submitted for orders

20/12/24

N B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Mr J. Ramappa wants Govt to issue instructions to this Court to cancel the order passed in the case and for future guidance Govt Counsel issue directions to this Court to cancel a judicial order which has to be set aside only by the Appellate Court.

The letter may perhaps be sent to the Chief Court for disposal.

22/12

Dy Secy.
1st Member

5723
20/12

Mother letter addressed to the Secy & C Second Secy is also put up.

22/12

The settled practice of this Govt may be kept up. Judicial tribunals must be guided by their knowledge of the Collector in all matters where he decides and this Govt will support him.

22/12

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

Send with a draft.
8/1/25

8/1/25

3/1

5/1

8/1

Routine Notes. CB 124 — 24

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

4) To the Regr. Chief Court
No P. 3493 dt 10-1-25

Forwards the letter dt 18-12-24 from Mr. J. Rudrappa complaining that the Munsiff Tumkur refuses an adjournment during the session of the Dist. Court and requests to obtain and forward with the opinion of the Chief Court the explanation of the Munsiff as to why he disregarded the instructions given to him.

14/3
Sent
19/1

6 From
The Registrar Chief Court-
Letter no Rule 77 dt 25-2-25

Forwards the explanation of the Munsiff together with the opinion of the District Judge and does not raise the question whether the Govt. or the Chief Court have not powers to interfere with the judicial discretion of the Presiding Officer

7) Submitted for perusal. The party Mr J. Rudrappa had got the ex parte decree cancelled on showing sufficient cause for the same. The explanation the Munsiff is flagged B. If the view of the Chief Court is accepted Govt. cannot issue any orders regarding the adjournment of cases

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. 11—8]

3726

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Apparently some members of the A.P. Legislature enacted

28/2/25 Put up the file in which the question concerning a general Circular order to this kind was disposed—

3/3

Add

The file referred to is flagged V+

5/3/25

The explanation of the Immigrant's statement case came up for hearing on 11-12-24 when the instructions from the Chief Court reached him on the 12-12-24. Besides, he says that it was a case in which three appearances had been granted for taking a further statement & so in his discretion, it was not a fit case for adjournment.

N.B.- Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

1) The munsiff should see that the evidence recorded is to the point showing cause.

No further notice seems to be necessary, as to the conduct of the munsiff.

2) In this connection the Chief Court raise the general issue as to the propriety of issuing general instructions to a Court in the case or even the Chief Court or whether matter any superior Court to an inferior Court.

3) It is pointed out that it is objectionable on the following grounds viz:

(1) Under the provisions of the Civil procedure Code it is ultra vires to issue instructions to a Court to adjourn a case as the matter is one to be done in the exercise of the discretion of the Court.

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

(2) These instructions would calculate to cause a delay of the trial of cases & would embarrass both judges & lawyers and

(3) they would inconvenience & put to pecuniary loss the opposite party or lawyer and in such cases the difficult question would arise as to whether the lawyer asking for an adjournment for his client should or should not pay the costs of the opposite side.

The chief court therefore suggests that in drawing such instructions ~~for~~ it would be better to leave the practitioners to arrange with the courts how to under such circumstances, they say, would generally exercise their discretion and if they do not, the appellate courts would rectify such errors

N. B.- Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must de copied, or slips pasted on this form.

W D 1860– GPB—1,50 000– 2 5-21.

3724

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

H. V.

(5) When a question of this kind was raised in the Secretariat, the case was discussed and noted upon. The final decision is recorded in the notes in the file put by H. V.

It will be seen therefore that the views expressed by the Chief Court were expressed there.

Under such circumstances the proposal of the Chief Court expressed in the penultimate para of his letter may be accepted.

Rees. 5/3

(8) I have already expressed my opinion upon the question of legality or otherwise of the Council order issued to all Courts to withdraw cases in which the members of the R.A.S.C. are engaged. (vide Flag C).

2nd Member. 2/2/23

8/3 9-3 5/3

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. [II—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

I fully agree with the Chief Court in the view taken of the — which is also that of the Law Secretary as recorded by him in the file No 1216-21

I do not think that a general order directing the Court — Civil or Criminal — to adjourn cases in convenience of Lawyers attending the Legislative Council is proper. Both the lengthy arguments and dates of the Chief Court and the Judges and Commissioners in Sind are matters for consideration.

(1) If an adjournment be allowed in a Criminal Case Court as a matter of Course.

When the Lawyers Engaged in such Cases have to attend the meetings of the Legislative Council they should apply to the Judges for adjournment, which should not claim the same indulgence in respect of meetings of the 1st Board, the Economic Board, Select Committees of the Legislative Council or other occasions when they

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

3726

WD 2310—GPP—10,000—31-5-24

Judl and Revenue Secretariat

6b. File No. 12u of 19 2u.

Serial No.

may be employed on public work within their States; and with the Govt. be prepared to grant his indulgence.

(2) If this ~~indulgence~~ concession is shown to the Lawyer, why should not his same concession be shown to all other members of the Deputation of Legislative Council & Secretary of all public bodies; and the Courts ordered to adjourn all cases in which the members of these bodies ~~his~~ have to appear as parties & witnesses during the days on which the orders are obtained.

21) I think that it should be left to his Lawyer as to other members of the public bodies to choose between their private engagement work & the performance of their public duty as members of the Leg. Council or Deputation &c: and they should not expect that first the Hon'ble Judges & Courts ~~to~~ by this order for their convenience have to alter the public bodies.

22) This may be submitted to Dewan Sb

Dewan

DEWAN'S OFFICE.
RECD. ON 31. MAR. 1925
Reg. No. 1299

Dr
30/3/25
Sd
20/3
28
34/3

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

I do not think that an order like this one would interfere with the proceedings of the Court. It is an instruction from the Court which the Court may or may not change that when it has appointed the instructions from; it does leave it discretion upon what grounds as in this case - the Justices of Court have an entire independence as regards their functions, as servants of state: they are bound to obey the instructions issued from time to time by state so long as those instructions do not interfere with their functions - the instructions are in their way of recommendations to them and they are expected to carry them out as far as possible.

The decision of representation should not be a decision touching from the Executive Government of the Country.

The practice of issuing such instructions is in existence from the time of Lord Chancellor, and the Courts have so far as possible given effect to such instructions.

It is not actually that the King

3726

12

TE.

Gene

192 .

Date		Remarks
	Put up me file referred to Mr Lee-Warner	

C … with the Representation … Council. Especially like those … Council when the points asked … have refused should …

… Lee … Council.

There is no such file in the Colonial Office section. The C.O. Index may perhaps be consulted

4/4/15

… to C.O. …

… 1/4.

… Chief Clerk …

… 3/4.

4/4

WD 2314—GPB—2000—28-6-22.

Urgent Subject- 12

Adjournment of cases posted during the meetings of the Representative Assembly and Legislative Council when the legal practitioners or parties concerned in the cases happen to be members of those bodies.

OPINION OF THE COUNCIL.

The Council agree with the views of the Chief Court, and the practice of issuing the Circular ~~in question should cease~~. Need not be continued. The Chief Court may be informed accordingly.

16/6/25.

To issue today

L to L Secy with Compts.

Issue
16/6
16/6

Draft Circular - may be approved

16/6/25

16/6

app'd
16/6

16/6

To. The Registrar Chief Court 7

P. 6714 dated 16/6/25.

States that govt agree with the views expressed by the Chief Court re the practice of issuing general orders to the subordinate courts to dispose such cases.

15
17/6

27088

J. RUDRAPPA, M.A.,LL.B.,
Advocate
Member, Legislative Council & Representative Assembly

2/9/24

15 2093

TUMKUR
18th December 1924.

CS 124-4-3

The Secretary,
Local and Legislative Department,
Governemnt of H.H the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Dear Sir,

I regret to inform you that inspite of the instructions to all courts in the State to adjourn the cases of those who att- the Representative assembly and Legislative Council, the First - Munsiff of Tumkur has refused an adjournment to me in one of my - cases, though my friends who appeared for me informed the court about my council meeting on at date. A similar instance happened to me last time also. I do not know why he refused an adjounemnt to me. I bring this to your nice so that you may inform the - authorities concerned to issue necessary instructions to cancel the orders passed in my absence and not to repeat such things in future.

Thanking you.

I remain,

Yours Sincerely/
J. Rudrappa.

2755 16

J. RUDRAPPA, M.A.,LL.B.,
Advocate
Member, Legislative Council & Representative Assembly

TUMKUR
18th Dec, 1924

752.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
19. DEC. 1924
REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY,
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL &
ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

To

The Secretary,

Legislative Council,

Bangalore.

Dear Sir,

I regret to inform you that inspite of the instructions to all courts in the State to adjourn the cases of those who attend the Representative Assembly and Legislative Council the First Munsiff of Tumkur has refused an adjournment to me in one of my cases, though my friends who appeared for me informed the court about my council meeting on that date. A similar instance happened to me last time. I do not know why he refused an adjournment to me. I bring this to your notice so that you may inform the authorities concerned to issue necessary instructions to cancel the order passed in my absence and not to repeat such things in future.

Thanking you,

I remain/

Yours sincerely,

J. Rudrappa.

Local Hegde Secy with
Compliments for favour
of disposal
RG
18/12
PB
22/12

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the *191* .

Date of issue 10/1/25

Signed by M. [illegible]

Section C5

File No. 124—24

Serial No 4

No. 3493

Enc sent on 12.1.25

To The Regr Ernakulam Court

Sir

I am directed to forward herewith ~~a copy of~~ the letter dt 18.12.24 from Mr. J Rudolph M.A.L.L.B. Advocate complaining that the trust munsiff at Tenkasi refused an adjournment to him in spite of instructions (Vide letter P 2982/ C5 124-24-2 dt 10.12.24) and to request you to kindly obtain and forward with the enclosures

over.

to the Chief Court, the explanation
of the Municipality as to why he disobeyed
the instructions given to him

Thanks

9/1

9/1/25.

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

3726
Cts 124-24-6.

Telgm:
"JUSTICE"

CHIEF COURT OF MYSORE,
Public Office Buildings, Cubbon Park,
Bangalore 25th February 1925.

CONFIDENTIAL.

R. O. C. No. 877
Dis: 24-25

From

A. Sreenivasaragavachari, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore.

To

B. NAGAPPA, Esq., Bar-at-Law,
Secretary to Government,
Local and Legislative Departments.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your Confidential letter No.P.3493/Cts. 124-24-4 dated the 10th January 1925, forwarding a letter dated the 18th December 1924 from Mr. J. Rudrappa, M.A.,LL.B., Advocate and member of the Legislative Council and Representative Assembly, complaining against the First Munsiff of Tumkur in having refused an adjournment in spite of instructions (Vide your letter No.P.2982/Cts. 124-24-2 dated 10th December 1924), and requesting to obtain and forward, with the opinion of the Chief Court, the explanation of the Munsiff.

2. In reply, I am to forward herewith copies of the letters from the Munsiff and the District Judge in the matter, and to state as follows :--

The contents of your letter dated 10th December 1924, above referred to, were communicated to the District Judges and in their turn to the Munsiffs and Subordinate Judges without any undue delay. The Munsiff reports that he received the communication on 12th December 1924, whereas the case of Mr. Rudrappa referred to, came on for hearing

on the previous day itself, and the Munsiff could not have been aware of the instructions at the time of disposing Mr. Rudrappa's case.

Moreover, Mr. Rudrappa does not seem to have any legitimate cause for complaint as the Munsiff's explanation and the District Judge's letter show. The case appears to have been a simple one in which a written statement had to be filed, and the advocate is reported to have taken three adjournments previously for the same purpose. It cannot therefore be said that the meeting of the Legislative Council was a sufficient excuse for the advocate's not being ready with his written statement; and the Chief Court agrees with the District Judge that the Munsiff's refusal to grant the adjournment was not unjustifiable, so far as the merits of the case are concerned.

3. In this connection I am to invite reference to similar letters issued previously by the Local and Legislative Secretariat, as noted in the margin*, and to state that the wider question,

* No.P.6854/Cts. dated 21st June 1924.
Camp No.1 dated 10th December 1924.
No.P.4088/Cts.124-24-5 dated 31st January 1925.(This relates to the cases of a particular advocate to attend a select Committee Meeting).

whether Government or the Chief Court or any other superior Court can interfere with the discretion of a subordinate Court in the matter of granting or refusing adjournments in particular cases, has to be considered. All Civil Courts are bound by the Civil Procedure Code which lays down the procedure to be followed in the trial of cases. Order 17, rules 1, 2 and 3 relate to

to adjournments; under rule 1, the Court may, if sufficient cause is shown, at any stage of a suit, grant time to parties or to any of them, and may from time to time adjourn the hearing of a suit, provided that when the hearing of evidence is once begun, the hearing of the suit should ordinarily be continued from day to day, until all witnesses in attendance have been examined unless the Court finds an adjournment necessary for reasons to be recorded. Rules 2 and 3 lay down the procedure of disposal if parties fail to appear or to do any necessary act for the progress of the suit for which time has been allotted. The granting of adjournments or their refusal is a judicial order in which Courts have to exercise their discretion on the merits in individual cases; and the Courts' act in granting or refusing adjournments can only be questioned by superior courts when the matter is taken up judicially in appeal or otherwise. The issue of general instructions by the Chief Court or by Government to adjourn a particular class of cases or cases in which a particular class of persons appear would be ultra vires, and inconsistent with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code.

I am to observe, in the next place, that general instructions of the kind in question are calculated to inconvenience the work of Courts and delay the trial of cases. It will furnish an additional excuse to both slack Judges and lawyers for adjourning cases. I am to observe that it is not necessary that all cases in which a legal practitioner, who happens to be a member of the Representative Assembly or Legislative Council, should be adjourned indiscriminately. There may be cases where the advocate's presence may not be necessary, e.g., he may have a Junior to conduct it for him, or it may not be difficult

difficult for him (having regard to the importance of the hearing) to make other arrangements for the conduct of the case, e.g., by requesting another practitioner to appear for him -- all of which are factors to be considered by a Court exercising its discretion in granting or refusing adjournments. If the practitioner's presence personally is absolutely necessary, the Chief Court has no doubt that most of the Judges of subordinate Courts would readily grant adjournments.

Again, a Circular of this kind does not take into account the inconvenience and pecuniary loss entailed not only on the witnesses, but also on parties and pleaders on the opposite side, who may not be members of either the Representative Assembly or Legislative Council. If an adjournment is to be granted for the convenience of a particular practitioner (and it may be observed that with the introduction of the Reforms, there are likely to be a large number of regular Sessions, Select Committee Meetings, etc. of the Representative Assembly and Legislative Council going on all through the year), the Court will be justified in granting cost of the day to the other side, and difficulties would arise as to who should meet such costs. A legal practitioner's duty, it may be observed, towards his client is more important and supreme than any other duty, and in cases where he himself cannot attend the hearings (for any reason whatsoever) it is his duty to arrange for the conduct of the case; otherwise the client will have a ground for damages against him. A legal practitioner is not entitled to move superior authorities on the administrative side to obtain adjournments by issue of Circulars or otherwise, which he is not entitled to under the Civil Procedure Code. As far as the Chief Court is aware, no such Circular has been issued by any other High Courts in British India.

While the Chief Court has every sympathy for the convenience of legal practitioners, who happen to be members of the Representative Assembly and Legislative Council while attending their sessions, the Judges consider that that object cannot be attained by the issue of any general orders The best thing appears to be for such legal practitioners to make suitable and timely arrangements for the conduct of their cases during the periods they are likely to be absent in Session, except of course where their personal appearance is absolutely necessary, in which case they may make an application to the Court under the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code for adjournments. The Chief Court has no doubt that the subordinate Courts will exercise their discretion properly and judicially in the matter of granting adjournments in such cases. For the rest, appellate Courts may be trusted to set right any incorrect orders passed by subordinate Courts.

4. The enclosures to your letter ~~are~~ is herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Theeniosadoporchan 26/2/25

R E G I S T R A R.

TMN/

Letter No.6108/403 dated 13th February 1925, from the District Judge, Bangalore Division, to the Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore, Bangalore.

****

Adverting to your R.O.C. No.877/24-25 dated 19th January 1925, forwarding copy of letter dated 18th December 1924 addressed to the Secretary, Local and Legislative Departments by Mr. J. Rudrappa, Advocate and member of the Legislative Council and Representative Assembly, Tumkur, bringing to notice that the First Munsiff of Tumkur refused to adjourn his case in spite of instructions, and requesting to obtain and forward with my opinion the explanation of the Munsiff as to why he disobeyed the instructions given to him, I have the honour to forward herewith the explanation of the Munsiff in original. The copy of the Secretary's letter was received through the Chief Court, in this office on 11-12-24 and a copy was despatched on the same day to all the Subordinate Courts. The Munsiff's letter shows that the advocate had to file a written statement on 11th December 1924 and it is not clear why the advocate did not file the written statement though he had taken three adjournments previously. As the Munsiff received the intimation only on the 12th I cannot say that his action was unjustifiable.

"COPY"

REGISTRAR.

TMN/

Letter No.146 dated the 5th February 1925 from Mr. A. Sundara Raja Rao, ~~Esq~~., B.A.,B.L., First Munsiff, Tumkur, to Mr. G. Srinivasa Iyer, B.A.,M.L., District Judge, Bangalore.

****

With reference to your letter No.4004/967 dated 22nd January 1925, calling for my explanation, I have the honour to state as follows :--

Mr. J. Rudrappa does not seem to have correctly represented the facts. He does not say in what case I refused an adjournment and when. The letter No.P.2982/C.78, 124-24-2 dated 10th December 1924, was sent by the District Court on 11-12-24. It was received in this office on 12-12-24. I have given effect to the orders contained in that letter and I have not in the least disobeyed the instructions issued in reference No.D2.Dis.665 of 1924-25 from the Chief Court; I would be the last man to disobey the orders issued from the superior authorities.

Even without any instructions from the Chief Court or from the Government, I have been granting adjournments in cases, when the members of the bar are inconvenienced in attending the Court owing to meetings of the Representative Assembly and of the Legislative Council. Mr. Rudrappa himself has received such indulgence in many cases. I have gone through all the cases of his, which came for hearing during this period and they are not many. So far as I could see before the receipt of the Chief Court order, there was a case of Mr. Rudrappa on 11-12-24, for filing of a written statement in which, time had been granted thrice already. In the exercise of my judicial discretion, I could not grant him further opportunity as the lawyer, who appeared for him again moved for an adjournment. I would have been bound to grant an adjournment in that case if

if the instructions of the Chief Court had been received by that time. As it is, it came a day later. The case in which an ex-parte order had been passed, has been set aside on Mr. Rudrappa showing sufficient grounds for the setting aside of the order.

I have nothing more to add.

****

"Copy".

Registrar.

TMN/

App.F.VI-G1.]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

Section 15

File No. 124-24

Serial No. 7

No. 6764

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the 192

To The Asst. Chief Court

Date of issue 16/6/25

Signed by Asst. T.S.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. Roc 877/24-25 of 25.2.25 in the matter of the adjournment of cases posted during the meetings of the R.A.A.L.C. when the legal practitioners or public concerned in the cases happen to be members of those bodies, I am directed to state that Govt agree with the views expressed by the chief court with regard to the matter of issuing circular instructions general orders to the Subordinate Courts to adjourn such cases.

I am &c

over

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

C.411

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

The re. adjournment of cases in which the legal practitioners or parties happen to be members of the B. A. or L.C.

Put up, as directed

If any request is preferred on the present occasion, a letter may issue to the Ch. Ct, as on previous occasions, pending final decision on the pnl. question

Perused. J.V. 5.6.25

To Secy. with Compts

6/6/25

As the Krishnaswami has advocate (B. A. Member) requests, a letter may be issued as above

7.6

7.6

Perused. Compts 6/6/25

Secy. with compts & seven copies

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

b 411

D4F

G. R. S. [II—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

The draft has been issued.

The file may perhaps be shd to I Pember for perusal.

MR. 7/6 (4 members) 2/6

143/8.6

Seen.

I have in my minute in the Shipping Expenses my suggestion of asking the Committee to adjourn sine die & send the Convention & Members of the Legislative Council & Rep. Assembly.

This may be submitted for decision on the general question

10/6

Lewin)

Maybe informally considered in C 11.6 15.6

11.6

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

9265

Chief Sec with (compts)

8/4 15.6

8/ 15.6

App.F.VI-G1.]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, the 192

Date of issue 7/6/25

Signed by Mr. V.S.

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Camp No. 4

To The Regr. Chief Comp.

Sir,

I am directed to request you to kindly issue instructions to the subordinate civil & criminal courts to adjourn the cases in which advocates & pleaders who are members of the R. A., appear during the present Session of the R. A.

I have the

over

Camp No 5-15
copy of D.O. to Executive Judge
D.O. to Munsif

My dear Srinivasam

Just a line
to say that, as usual,
a letter may go to Court
about Case's being adjourned
in which the lawyers are
supposed at the R.-A.-Meeting,

Y. S

Rg

3/6.

Sent him it on
Wrapping wrote. Chief Secretary
3/6 3/6

M. Gonapath 3/6